arXiv:1703.06542v1 [quant-ph] 19 Mar 2017

Constructing unextendible product bases from the old ones

Yan-Ling Wang[1], Mao-Sheng Li[2], Shao-Ming Fei[3,4], Zhu-Jun Zheng[1]
[1] *School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510640, China*
[2] *School of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*
[3] *School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China*
[4] *Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, 04103 Leipzig, Germany*

We studied the construction problem of the unextendible product basis (UPB). We mainly give a method to construct a UPB of a quantum system through the UPBs of its subsystem. Using this method and the UPBs which are known for us, we construct different kinds of UPBs in general bipartite quantum system. Then we use these UPBs to construct a family of UPBs in multipartite quantum system. The UPBs can be used to construct the bound entangled states with different ranks.

I. INTRODUCTION

The notion of unextendible product bases (UPBs) plays an important role in quantum information theory. Since it was been proposed in 1999 by Bennett *et al*[1], it has been extensively investigated. Considerable elegant results have been obtained with interesting applications to the theory of quantum information. Such as the construction of bound entangled states[1–3] and indecomposible positive maps[4]. And UPB have also been shown to give rise to Bell inequalities without a quantum violation[5] and they can not be perfectly distinguished by local quantum operations and classical communication, even though they contain no entanglement[6]. The UPB is a set of incomplete orthonormal product states whose complementary space has no product states. It was also shown that the space complementary to a UPB contains bound entanglement [7].

In the past years, there also have many results about the construction of UPBs. The first UPB is a set with five product states in $\mathbb{C}^3\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^3$ which was constructed by Bennett *et al* in 1999 [1]. Then in [8], the authors used the orthogonal graph to construct a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^m\otimes\mathbb{C}^n(m\geq 3, n>3, m\leq n)$ with number $mn-2m+1$. It is interesting to characterize the minimal number of product states in order to form a UPB. In [12], the authors showed that in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{d_2}\ldots\otimes\mathbb{C}^{d_m}$ the minimum size of UPB is $\sum_{i=1}^{m}(d_i-1)+1$ for every sequence of integers $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m \geq 2$ unless either (i) $m=2$ and $2\in\{d_1,d_2\}$ or (ii) $\sum_{i=1}^{m}(d_i-1)+1$ is odd and at least one d_i is even. In 2015, the authors further determined the unsolved minimum number in bipartite cases as well as a large family of multipartite cases[13]. Moreover, Johnston focused on the structure of qubit UPB and obtained a class of UPB with different number of states[10]. However, there are only a few cases whose structure of UPBs were completely characterized: $\mathbb{C}^2\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^n$, $\mathbb{C}^3\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^3$, $\mathbb{C}^2\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^2\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^2$, and $\mathbb{C}^2\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^2\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^2\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^2$ [1, 8–10]. More recently, the authors focused on the characterization of the UPB in $\mathbb{C}^3\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^4$ [11].

From [8, 10], the author derived some methods to obtain a UPB of higher dimensional system via some small systems. For example, it was showed that the tensor product of UPBs is again a UPB of higher dimensional system. That is, given two bipartite UPBs $S_1=\{|\psi_i^1\rangle, i=1,2,\ldots,l_1\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n_1}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_1}$ and $S_2=\{|\psi_i^2\rangle, i=1,2,\ldots,l_2\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n_2}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_2}$, the states $\{|\psi_i^1\rangle\otimes|\psi_j^2\rangle\}_{i,j=1}^{l_1,l_2}$ are again product states which is proved to form a bipartite UPB on $\mathbb{C}^{n_1n_2}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_1m_2}$. Hence in order to characterize the UPBs, it is worth to give more methods to obtain some new UPBs.

In this paper, we mainly pay attention to the constructions of UPBs in bipartite system. Embedding the bipartite systems $\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ as two orthogonal subsystems of $\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^{n_1+n_2}$, we proved that the union of UPBs of the two subsystems is again a UPB of the whole system. Then we used this method to construct lots of UPBs in general bipartite quantum system $\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^n$ from some haven knew results. More precisely, we used this method to construct a large number of UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^n\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^n$ whose missing states number of states are varying from 4 to $\frac{n^2}{2}$. (Here we specific explain the words "missing states number": If the set $S=\{|\psi_i\rangle \mid i=1,2,\ldots,k, k<mn\}$ is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^n$, then $mn-k$ is the missing states number of S, it characterize how far is the UPBs in order to form a base of the whole system.) Moreover, for the general bipartite quantum system $\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^n(m\geq 4, n\geq 10)$, we obtained the UPBs with missing number varying from 4 to $(m-1)(n-8)$. At last, we also pay our attention to the multipartite quantum systems and give a method to derive a UPB from UPB in less partite system. Then we use the UPBs in bipartite quantum system to construct a family UPBs in multipartite quantum systems.

II. PRELIMINARY

Definition[1, 8]. A set of states $\{|\phi_i\rangle\in\mathbb{C}^m\bigotimes\mathbb{C}^n : i=1,2,\cdots,k, k<mn\}$ is called a k-member UPB if and only if

(i) $|\phi_i\rangle$, $i=1,2,\cdots,k$, are product states;

(ii) $\langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle=\delta_{ij}$;

(iii) if $\langle\phi_i|\psi\rangle = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, then $|\psi\rangle$ cannot be product state.

Now we present the results of the minimal number of UPBs in bipartite quantum system[12, 13].

Lemma 1. *Let $f(d_1, d_2)$ be the smallest possible number of states in a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} (d_1, d_2 \geq 3)$. Then:*
(1) If either d_1 or d_2 is odd, then $f(d_1, d_2) = d_1 + d_2 - 1$.
(2) If both of d_1 and d_2 are even, then $f(d_1, d_2) = d_1 + d_2$.

In addition, there is a family of UPBs for general bipartite quantum system [8].

Lemma 2. *In $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ with $n > 3, m \geq 3$ and $n \geq m$, there is a UPB of size $mn - 2m + 1$.*

III. UPBS IN BIPARTITE QUANTUM SYSTEM

In this section, we mainly pay attention to the construction of UPB in bipartite quantum system. Firstly, we give a general method to construct a UPB from some old ones as follow. Suppose $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ and $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ are orthogonal basis of quantum system A and B respectively. A pure state of the bipartite system is $|\psi\rangle = \sum m_{i,j}|ij\rangle$, then we call the $m \times n$ matrix $M_{|\psi\rangle}$ whose (i, j) entry is $m_{(i-1),(j-1)}$ the corresponding matrix of $|\psi\rangle$. It is easy to show that $|\psi\rangle$ is a product state if and only if the rank of $M_{|\psi\rangle}$ is 1.

Theorem 1. *Suppose in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$, there is a UPB with k_i missing states number for $i = 1, 2$, then there is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_1+n_2}$ with $k_1 + k_2$ missing states number. If we replace one of the UPB by a complete orthogonal product base and corresponding k_i by 0. The conclusion still holds.*

Proof: We only prove the first statement, the second can be proved similarly. Suppose that $\{|i\rangle_A \mid i = 0, 1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and $\{|j\rangle_B \mid j = 0, 1, \ldots, n_1 + n_2 - 1\}$ are standard normal basis of system A and B respectively. Set

$$L = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|ij\rangle \mid 0 \leq i \leq m-1; 0 \leq j \leq n_1 - 1\},$$
$$R = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|ij\rangle \mid 0 \leq i \leq m-1; n_1 \leq j \leq n_1 + n_2 - 1\}.$$

Then L and R can be looked as the bipartite systems $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$. Hence, we can suppose $S_L = \{|v_i\rangle \in L \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, mn_1 - k_1\}$ and $S_R = \{|w_j\rangle \in R \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, mn_2 - k_2\}$ are the UPB in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ respectively. We claim that $S_L \cup S_R$ is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_1+n_2}$.

Clearly, the states in $S_L \cup S_R$ are orthogonal with each other. Suppose $H_{S_L} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}(S_L), H_{S_R} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}(S_R)$ and $H_{S_L} \oplus H_{S_L}^{\perp} = L, H_{S_R} \oplus H_{S_R}^{\perp} = R$. That is, $H_{S_L}^{\perp}$ (resp.$H_{S_R}^{\perp}$)is the set of states in L(resp.R) that is orthogonal all the states in H_{S_L}(resp.H_{S_R}). Then we have the following orthogonal decomposition:

$$V = L \oplus R = H_{S_L} \oplus H_{S_L}^{\perp} \oplus H_{S_R} \oplus H_{S_R}^{\perp}.$$

Since $S_L \cup S_R$ are orthogonal with each other, then we have $H_{S_L \cup S_R} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}(S_L \cup S_R) = H_{S_L} \oplus H_{S_R}$. By the above orthogonal decomposition , $H_{S_L \cup S_R}^{\perp} \supseteq H_{S_L}^{\perp} \oplus H_{S_R}^{\perp}$. Since the states S_L and S_R are linearly independent, we can obtain that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(H_{S_L \cup S_R}^{\perp}) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(H_{S_L}^{\perp}) + \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(H_{S_R}^{\perp}).$$

With this equality and the above inclusion relation, we obtain $H_{S_L \cup S_R}^{\perp} = H_{S_L}^{\perp} \oplus H_{S_R}^{\perp}$. Then we only need to show that there are no product states in $H_{S_L \cup S_R}^{\perp}$. Now for any nonzero vector $|\alpha\rangle \in H_{S_L \cup S_R}^{\perp}$, $|\alpha\rangle = a|v\rangle + b|w\rangle$ for $|v\rangle \in H_{S_L}^{\perp}, |w\rangle \in H_{S_R}^{\perp}$. If we consider the corresponding matrix to $|\alpha\rangle$. Suppose M_1 is the corresponding matrix of $a|v\rangle$, M_2 is the corresponding matrix of $b|w\rangle$, then $M = (M_1|M_2)$ is the matrix corresponding to $|\alpha\rangle$. Since one of $a|v\rangle$ or $b|w\rangle$ is nonzero, which is equivalent to $\mathrm{rank}(M_1) \geq 2$ or $\mathrm{rank}(M_2) \geq 2$. Since both two cases deduce that $\mathrm{rank}(M) \geq 2$, so $|\alpha\rangle$ is not a product state. Hence $S_L \cup S_R$ is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_1+n_2}$. ■

Example 1. Let $L = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|ij\rangle \mid i = 0, 1, 2; j = 0, 1, 2\}$, $R = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|ij\rangle \mid i = 0, 1, 2; j = 3, 4, 5\}$, then

$$L \cong \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3, \quad R \cong \mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3.$$

Let $S_L = \{|0\rangle|0-1\rangle, |0-1\rangle|2\rangle, |1-2\rangle|0\rangle, |2\rangle|1-2\rangle, |0+1+2\rangle|0+1+2\rangle\}$, $S_R = \{|0\rangle|3-4\rangle, |0-1\rangle|5\rangle, |2\rangle|4-5\rangle, |1-2\rangle|3\rangle, |0+1+2\rangle|3+4+5\rangle\}$. Then S_L is a UPB in L, S_R is a UPB in R. By the theorem 1. we have $S_L \cup S_R$ is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^6 \otimes \mathbb{C}^6$. The specific states present in FIG.1.



FIG. 1: The construction of UPB in $\mathbb{C}^6 \bigotimes \mathbb{C}^6$ by two subsystems $\mathbb{C}^3 \bigotimes \mathbb{C}^3$. The left part representation the system L, the right part representation the system R. The state $|0+1+2\rangle|0+1+2\rangle$ and $|0+1+2\rangle|3+4+5\rangle$ are not shown on this figure.

Theorem 2. *If there is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{m_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ with k_i missing states number for $i = 1, 2$, then there is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{m_1+m_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ with $k_1 + k_2$ missing states number.*

Proof: The proof is similar with the argument of theorem 1. ■

Corollary 1. *If there is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{m_i}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ with k_{ij} missing states number$(i,j=1,2)$, then there is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{m_1+m_2}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{n_1+n_2}$ with $k_{11}+k_{12}+k_{21}+k_{22}$ missing states number.*

Now we apply the above method to derive families of UPBs in bipartite quantum system.

Theorem 3. *In $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^m(7\leq n\leq m\leq n+1)$, there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $\lfloor\frac{mn}{2}\rfloor+1$.*

Proof: We prove by induction on n such that in $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^m$ $(n\leq m\leq n+1)$ there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $\lfloor\frac{mn}{2}\rfloor+1$.

We have checked the statement for $n=7,8,\ldots,13$(see the table in APPENDIX). By induction the statement holds for $7\leq k\leq n-1$, we need to prove that it also holds for n. We can suppose $n\geq 14$.

Now we consider the case $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^m$ with $n\leq m\leq n+1$. There is a unique expression as the sum of two integers $n=n_1+n_2$ such that $n_1\leq n_2\leq n_1+1$. Similarly, we write $m=m_1+m_2$ with similar condition. It is not difficult to check that $|n_i-m_j|\leq 1$ and $n_i\geq 7, m_j\geq 7$ for all $i,j\in\{1,2\}$. Then $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^m$ can be looked as

$\mathbb{C}^{n_1}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_1}$	$\mathbb{C}^{n_1}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_2}$
$\mathbb{C}^{n_2}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_1}$	$\mathbb{C}^{n_2}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_2}$

Then by induction, there are UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{n_i}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{m_j}$ with missing state number varying from 4 to $\lfloor\frac{n_im_j}{2}\rfloor+1$. Then by corollary 1, we can obtain some UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^m$ with missing state number varying from 16 to $\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\lfloor\frac{n_im_j}{2}\rfloor+1)$. Clearly, there are also UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^m$ with missing states number varying from 4 to 16 which can be seem as induced from $\mathbb{C}^7\otimes\mathbb{C}^7$. Moreover, we have the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\lfloor\frac{n_im_j}{2}\rfloor+1) &\geq \sum_{i,j=1}^{2}((\frac{n_im_j}{2}-\frac{1}{2})+1)\\ &= (\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\frac{n_im_j}{2})+2\\ &\geq \lfloor\frac{nm}{2}\rfloor+1.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds for $\lfloor\frac{N}{2}\rfloor$ is equal to $\frac{N}{2}$ when N is even and equal to $\frac{N-1}{2}$ when N is odd. ■

The following figure show another proof of theorem 3, we can use the UPBs in the first triangle to obtain the UPBs in the second triangle. Then use the second one to obtain the third one and so on.



FIG. 2: Another idea of the proof of theorem 3.

Theorem 4. *In $\mathbb{C}^n\otimes\mathbb{C}^7(7\leq n)$, there are UPBs with missing states number $4,5,...,6n-14,6n-12,6n-6$.*

Proof: Now we prove the above statement by induction. The cases n=7,8,9,10 have been calculated in the table of APPENDIX. Suppose for any n with $7 \leq n \leq k$, the statement in the theorem is correct. We should use this to prove that it is also correct for the case $n = k+1$. Moreover, we can assume that $k \geq 10$. Then $\mathbb{C}^{k+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ can be seem as

$$(\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^7) \oplus (\mathbb{C}^{k-2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7) \text{ or } (\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^7) \oplus (\mathbb{C}^{k-3} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7).$$

By induction, there are UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{k-2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ (resp. $\mathbb{C}^{k-3} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$) with missing state number $4, 5, ..., 6k-26, 6k-24, 6k-18$(resp.$4, 5, ..., 6k-32, 6k-30, 6k-24$). After considering the UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ and $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ and by using theorem 1, we can obtain UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{k+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ with missing number $4, 5, ..., 6k-8, 6k-6$. At last, the UPB with missing state number equal to $6k$ are derived from the minimal number UPB as showed in lemma 1 . ■

Theorem 5. *In $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n (m \geq 2, n \geq 10)$, there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $2m(n-8)$.*

Proof: $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ can be seem as $(\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n-7}) \oplus (\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7)$. We notice that, by lemma 1, there is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^k$ $(3 \leq k \leq n-7)$ with number $2m+1+k-1$, hence with missing states number $(2m+1)k-(2m+1)-k+1 = 2mk-2m = 2m(k-1)$. Hence all these can extends to be UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n-7}$ with missing states number $2m(k-1)$ $(3 \leq k \leq n-7)$. Moreover, by theorem 4, in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ hence in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$, there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $12m-8$, where $12m-8 > 4m+4$ when $m \geq 2$.

For any $4m+4 < l < 2m(n-8)$, l can be expressed as $l = q(2m)+r$ with $0 \leq r < 2m$, $2 \leq q < n-8$. In the following, according to the condition of r, we express l as a sum whose first term are reachable missing states number in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n-7}$ and second term are reachable missing states number in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$. Then by theorem 1, we obtain a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{2m+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ with l missing state number.

(i) If $r = 0$, then $l = q(2m)+0$.
(ii)If $0 < r < 4$, then $l = (q-1)(2m)+(2m+r)$.
(iii)If $4 \leq r < 2m$, then $l = q(2m)+r$. ■

Theorem 6. *In $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n (m \geq 2, n \geq 10)$, there are UPBs with missing number varying from 4 to $(2m-1)(n-8)$.*

Proof: The proof is just similar with theorem 3. In $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^k$ there are UPB with $2m+k$ states, hence with $2mk-2m-k = 2m(k-1)-(k-1)-1 = (2m-1)(k-1)-1$ missing states. Hence all these can extend to UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n-7}$ with $(2m-1)(k-1)-1$ $(3 \leq k \leq n-7)$ missing states number. Moreover, by theorem 4, there are UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$ with missing states number varying from 4 to $12m-14$, where $12m-14 \geq 4m+1$ when $m \geq 2$.

For any $4m+1 < l < (2m-1)(n-8)-1$, l can be expressed as $l+1 = q(2m-1)+r$ with $0 \leq r < 2m-1$ and $2 \leq q < n-8$. In the following, according to the condition of r, we express l as a sum whose first term are reachable missing states number in $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n-7}$ and second term are reachable missing states number in $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^7$. Then by theorem 1, we obtain a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{2m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ with l missing states number.

(i)If $r = 0$, then $l = (q(2m-1)-1)+0$.
(ii) If $0 < r < 4$, $l = ((q-1)(2m-1)-1)+(2m-1+r)$.
(iii)If $4 \leq r < 2m-1$, then $l = (q(2m-1)-1)+r$. ■

Corollary 2. *In $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ $(m \geq 4, n \geq 10)$, there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $(m-1)(n-8)$.*

*Proof:*Combining the conclusion of theorem 5 and theorem 6, we get the conclusion. ■

IV. UPBS IN MULTIPARTITE QUANTUM SYSTEMS

In this section, we first give a method which is originated from ref.[10] to construct a UPB of N-partite quantum systems by some UPBs in the $(N-1)$-partite quantum systems. Then combining this method with the UPBs we have obtained in bipartite quantum system above, we give a family of UPB in multipartite quantum system.

Lemma 3. *Suppose there are $K(K \geq 2)$ sets $\{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}\}$ of UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes ... \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ and we denote them as $\mathcal{P}^{(i)} = \{|\psi_j^{(i)}\rangle,\ j = 1, 2, ..., n^{(i)}\}$. Then the set $\mathcal{P} = \{|\psi_j^{(i)}\rangle|i-1\rangle, i = 1, 2, ..., K,\ j = 1, 2, ..., n^{(i)}\}$ is a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes ... \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N} \otimes \mathbb{C}^K$.*

Proof: Clearly, the states in $\mathcal{P}$ are all product states of $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes ... \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N} \otimes \mathbb{C}^K$. Moreover, they are orthogonal. So we only need to prove that there are no more product states in $\mathcal{P}^{\perp}$. Suppose $|\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle...|\phi_N\rangle|\phi_{N+1}\rangle$ is a nozero product state in $\mathcal{P}^{\perp}$. Since $|\phi_{N+1}\rangle$ is nonzero, there is an i_0 with $1 \leq i_0 \leq K$ such that $\langle i_0 - 1|\phi_{N+1}\rangle \neq 0$. Then the orthogonality between $|\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle...|\phi_N\rangle|\phi_{N+1}\rangle$ and $|\psi_j^{(i_0)}\rangle|i-1\rangle, j = 1, 2, ..., n^{(i_0)}$ give

$$(\langle\psi_j^{(i_0)}|)(|\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle...|\phi_N\rangle)\langle i_0 - 1|\phi_{N+1}\rangle = 0.$$

These imply that $|\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle...|\phi_N\rangle$ is an product state in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes ... \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ that is orthogonal to all the states in $\mathcal{P}^{(i_0)}$. However, this is contradicted with our assumption that $\mathcal{P}^{(i_0)}$ is a UPB. In conclusion, $\mathcal{P}$ is a UPB. ■

After replacing some sets $\{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}\}$ by the full product basis with at least a set is still a UPB, then $\{\mathcal{P}\}$ is also a UPB.

Theorem 7. *If in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes ... \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ $(d \geq 2)$ there are UPBs with missing states number from 4 to L with $L \geq 8$, then there are UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3} \otimes ... \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{N+1}}$ with missing states number varying from 4 to $d_{N+1}L$.*

Proof: Given any integer m with $4 \leq m \leq d_{N+1}L$, there is unique expression $m = qL + r, 0 \leq r < L$. By lemma 3, in order to construct a UPB in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{N+1}}$ with missing states number m, we only need to construct d_{N+1} sets of UPBs with missing states number $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^{d_{N+1}}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ such that $m = \sum_{i=1}^{d_{N+1}} m_i$. In the following, we separate our the construction of the d_{N+1} sets of UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_3} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ into three cases according to the number r.

(i) $4 \leq r < L$. In this case, $0 \leq q < d_{N+1}$. Let $\{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{q}$ be q sets of UPBs whose missing states number are all L. Moreover, let $\mathcal{P}^{(q+1)}$ be a UPB with missing states number r and for any integer $q+1 < i < d_{N+1}$ we let $\mathcal{P}^{(i)}$ be a set of full orthogonal product basis.

(ii) $0 < r < 4$. In this case, $1 \leq q < d_{N+1}$. Then $m = (q-1)L + (L - (4-r)) + 4$. Let $\{\mathcal{P}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{q-1}$ be $q-1$ sets of UPBs whose missing states number are all L. Moreover, let $\mathcal{P}^{(q)}$ be a UPB with missing states number $L-(4-r)$ whose existence is guaranteed by the assumption and the condition $4 \leq L-(4-r) \leq L$ and $\mathcal{P}^{(q+1)}$ be a UPB with missing states number 4. And for any integer $q+1 < i < d_{N+1}$ we let $\mathcal{P}^{(i)}$ be a set of full orthogonal product basis.

(iii)$r = 0$. That is, $m = qL$. This is the easiest case for it can derive from q sets of UPBs with L missing states number and $d_{N+1} - q$ sets of full orthogonal product basis in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$. ■

Now we use the above theorem 7 and lemma 3 to give lots of UPBs in multipartite quantum systems.

Corollary 3. *Suppose that* $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq d_3 \geq \ldots \geq d_N$ *and* $d_1 \geq 10, d_2 \geq 4, N \geq 3$. *Then in* $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$, *there are UPBs with missing states number varying from* 4 *to* $(d_1 - 8)(d_2 - 1)\prod_{i=3}^{N} d_i$.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We give a method to obtain new UPBs from the old ones. In order to show the power of the method, we use it to construct UPBs with different kinds of number. Firstly, we show that in $\mathbb{C}^n \bigotimes \mathbb{C}^n$ there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $\frac{n^2}{2}$. Then we study the more general quantum system $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n (m \geq 4, n \geq 10)$. And we obtain that there are UPBs with missing states number varying from 4 to $(m-1)(n-8)$. Moreover, use this results we can also obtain some results of the multipartite quantum systems.

We notice that there is some gap between the minimal number $f(m,n)$ of UPB and the number $mn-(m-1)(n-8)$. Hence it is very interesting to investigate whether there are some other UPBs whose numbers can full fill this gap. Moreover, it is well know that the UPBs can be used to construct bounded entangled states[1]. Hence using our results, one can obtain some bounded entangled states with different ranks. Hence it is valuable to derive some other methods that can full fill this gap which enable us to construct bounded entangled states with ranks varying from 4 to $mn - f(m,n)$.

Acknowledgments : This work is supported by the NSFC 11475178, NSFC 11571119 and NSFC 11275131.

[1] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Unextendible product bases and bound entanglement. Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5385-5388 (1999).

[2] J. M. Leinaas, P. Ø. Sollid, and J. Myrheim, Unextendible product bases and extremal density matrices with positive partial transpose. Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042325 (2011).

[3] L. Skowronek, Three-by-three bound entanglement with general unextendible product bases. J. Math. Phys. **52**, 122202 (2011).

[4] B. M. Terhal, A family of indecomposable positive linear maps based on entangled quantum states. Linear Algebra Appl. **323**, 61-73 (2001).

[5] R. Augusiak, J. Stasinska, C. Hadley, J. K. Korbicz, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, Bell inequalities with no quantum violation and unextendible product bases. Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 070401 (2011).

[6] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wooters, Quantum nonlocality without entanglement. Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1070-1091 (1999).

[7] P. Horodecki, Separability criterion and inseparable mixed states with positive partial transposition. Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333-339 (1997).

[8] D. P. Divincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal. Unextendible product bases, uncompletable product bases and bound entanglement. Commun. Math. Phys. **238**, 379-410 (2003).

[9] S. B. Bravyi, Unextendible product bases and locally unconvertible bound entangled states. Quantum Inf. Process. **3**, 309-329 (2004).

[10] N. Johnston, The structure of qubit unextendible product bases. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 424034 (2014).

[11] Y. Yang, F. Gao, G. Xu, H. Zuo, Z. Zhang, and Q. Wen, Characterizing unextendible product bases in qutrit-ququad system. Sci. Rep. **5**, 11963 (2015).

[12] N. Alon and L. Lovász, Unextendible product bases. J. Comb. Theory Ser. A **95**, 169-179 (2001)

[13] Jianxin Chen and N. Johnston, The Minimum Size of Unextendible Product Bases in the Bipartite Case (and Some Multipartite Cases). Commun. Math. Phys. **333**, 351-365 (2015)

[14] K. Feng, Unextendible product bases and 1-factorization of complete graphs. Discrete Appl. Math. **154**, 942-949 (2006).

VI. APPENDIX

Table 1: By using the UPBs in lemma 1, lemma 2 and those in $\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ in ref.[11], we calculate the missing state number of UPBs in $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ for small m, n by our method.

	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
3	4											
4	4-6	4-8										
5	4-6, 8	4-8, 12	4-9, 12, 16									
6	4-6, 8, 10	4-12, 14	4-14, 16, 20	4-16, 18, 20, 24								
7	4-6, 8-10, 12	4-14, 18	4-18, 20, 24	4-22, 24, 30	4-28, 30, 36							
8	4-6, 8-12, 14	4-18, 20	4-22, 24, 28	4-26, 28, 30, 34	4-34, 36, 42	4-40, 42, 48						
9	4-6, 8-14, 16	4-20, 24	4-26, 28, 32	4-32, 34, 40	4-40, 42, 48	4-46, 48, 56	4-54, 56, 64					
10	4-6, 8-16, 18	4-24, 26	4-30, 32, 36	4-36, 38, 40, 44	4-46, 48, 54	4-54, 56, 62	4-62, 64, 72	4-70, 72, 80				
11	4-6, 8-18, 20	4-26, 30	4-34, 36, 40	4-42, 44, 50	4-52, 54, 60	4-60, 62, 70	4-70, 72, 80	4-78, 80, 90	4-88, 90, 100			
12	4-6, 8-20, 22	4-30, 32	4-38, 40, 44	4-46, 48, 50, 54	4-58, 60, 66	4-68, 70, 76	4-78, 80, 88	4-88, 90, 98	4-98, 100, 110	4-108, 110, 120		
13	4-6, 8-22, 24	4-32, 36	4-42, 44, 48	4-52, 54, 60	4-64, 66, 72	4-74, 76, 84	4-86, 88, 96	4-96, 98, 108	4-108, 110, 120	4-118, 120, 132	4-130, 132, 144	
14	4-6, 8-24, 26	4-36, 38	4-46, 48, 52	4-56, 58, 60, 64	4-70, 72, 78	4-82, 84, 90	4-94, 96, 104	4-106, 108, 116	4-118, 120, 130	4-130, 132, 142	4-142, 144, 156	4-154, 156, 168